

1 November 1960

BRIEF FOR: CIA Career Council

SUBJECT : Review of Single Grade Promotion Policy

1. At its meeting on 30 April 1959 the Career Council discussed the use of grades GS-6, 8 and 10 as additional steps in the promotion ladder in the career management system of the various Career Services. It was agreed that these grades should be used Agency-wide on an experimental basis with the understanding that jobs in these areas would not be reclassified, but that promotions from GS-5, 7 and 9 would proceed by single step progression to grades GS-7, 9 and 11.

25X1 2. In order to implement the decision of the Council, Agency Notice [] was published on 15 May 1959. This notice provided that promotion actions for all staff personnel will be limited to one-grade advancements, exceptions to be made by the Director of Personnel in response to requests from Heads of Career Services. This notice expired 1 June 1960.

3. The attachments contain a review of the one-grade policy by presenting comments on the "pro" and "con" arguments resulting from the Career Council discussion of 30 April 1959. Before and after statistics on time-in-grade and compensation received under the two policies are also presented on the basis of a random sampling of the Career Services of the three major components.

4. The Office of Personnel recommends the "Alternate Course of Action", Number 4, as listed in the attachment, be adopted as Agency promotion policy; namely, single grade progression to GS-9, promotion from GS-9 to GS-11, followed by single grade advancement thereafter. The reasons advanced for this progression are listed in the attachment. If alternate Number 4 is adopted as policy, it would be necessary, concurrent with the adoption, to review all promotions to GS-10 effected subsequent to 15 May 1959 and to effect an additional promotion on an accelerated and scheduled basis to GS-11 prior to any promotions of employees who are presently GS-9 directly to GS-11. Failure to do so would surely generate morale problems based on charges of discrimination arising from vacillation in administrative policy.